CONTROL ID: 2960775

TITLE: Masking Ability of Monolithic CAD/CAM Materials With Different Abutments

AUTHORS (FIRST NAME INITIAL LAST NAME): L. Sadighpour 1, 2, F. Geramipanah 1, 3, Y. Daneshian 1

AUTHORS/INSTITUTIONS: L. Sadighpour, F. Geramipanah, Y. Daneshian, Prosthodontics, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Dentistry, Tehran, IRAN (THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)|L. Sadighpour, Dental Research Center, Dentistry Research Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, IRAN (THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)|F. Geramipanah, Dental Implant Research Center, Tehran University of edical Sciences, Tehran, IRAN (THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)|

PREFERRED PRESENTATION TYPE: Poster

CURRENT SCIENTIFIC GROUPS & NETWORKS: Prosthodontics Research

ABSTRACT BODY:

Objectives: Little information is available on the influence of monolithic CAD/CAM restorative materials and abutment colors and materials. Therefor the aim of the present study is to compare color difference of CIELab and CIE2000 color parameters of three monolithic CAD/CAM crowns over three different abutments.

Methods: Fifteen full crowns were fabricated for a model central incisor using three monolithic CAD/CAM restorative materials (n=5), Enamic (LT,A2,Vita Zahnfabric), Celtra Duo (LT,A2,Dentsply) and IPS.emax CAD (LT,A2,Vivadent/Ivoclar). The color parameters, CIELab (Δ Eab) abd CIE2000 (Δ E00) , of crowns over three types of substrates including A2 composite resin, A5 composite resin and titanium implant abutment, were measured with the aid of a portable digital device (Easy shade Compact , Vita Zahnfabric). Mean values of the color differences (Δ E and Δ E $_{00}$) against A2 shade tab of Vita classic shade guide were analyzed using 2-way ANOVA and Tukey's HSD (α =.05).

Results: Significant interaction was present among mean color difference (both ΔE_{ab} and ΔE 00) restorative materials and substrates (p=0.001). Enamic showed the lowest ΔE_{ab} over Ti (p< 0.05). However, no significant difference was found between Celtra and IPS.emax CAD with three abutment substrates. Among three substrates, the highest ΔE_{ab} was achieved A2 with Enamic crowns (P<0.05).

Celtra over A5 showed the lowest Δ E00 (p<0.05) and the highest over Ti (p<0.05). Enamic achieved the highest Δ E00 over A5 (p<0.05) and the lowest with Ti (p<0.05). IPS.emax CAD showed no significant Δ E00 difference over three substrates.

Conclusions: Within the limits of the present study, different monolithic CAD/CAM materials can influence on the final color of the crowns. The resulting color also s affected by underlying color of the abutment. Color difference is better detected using Δ E00 formula.

(no table selected)

TABLE FOOTER: (No Tables)

(No Image Selected)

KEYWORDS: Monolithic CAD/CAM materials, CIELab color parameters, CIE2000 color parameters, masking ability.

Support Funding Agency/Grant Number - Abstracts: (none)

Financial Interest Disclosure: This study was supported by a grant # 9011-272023 from Tehran University of Medical Sciences.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

AWARDS: IADR-BSODR Division-Unilever Poster Prize

Group Author Abstracts - Abstract: (none)

Session Chair Volunteers - Abstracts: Poster Session Chair

Special Scheduling Needs - Abstracts: (none)

Student Status - Abstracts: No

Student Other Designation - Abstracts: (none)

Abstract Submission - Track Selection: Clinician Track